

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: A-65353-6/RFT/RMS/RMK

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: ) Examiner: Unknown  
 )  
MAYO, et al. ) Group Art Unit: 2721  
 )  
Serial No.: Unknown )  
 )  
Filed: Herewith )  
 )  
For: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR )  
AUTOMATED PROTEIN DESIGN )  
 )

NUMBER "EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL  
EL821722513US

DATE OF DEPOSIT March 19, 2001

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER OR FEE IS  
BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES  
POSTAL SERVICE "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO  
ADDRESSEE" SERVICE UNDER 37 CFR 1.10 ON THE  
DATE INDICATED ABOVE AND IS ADDRESSED TO:  
BOX PATENT APPLICATION, ASSISTANT  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, WASHINGTON, DC  
20231.

TYPED NAME Vincent Diaz

SIGNED Vincent M Diaz

PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT

Assistant Commissioner of Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

Prior to examination of the above identified application, please amend as follows:

In the Specification:

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 1, line 2, with the following  
rewritten paragraph:

--This application claims the benefit of U.S.S.N.s 60/043,464, filed April  
11, 1997, 60/054,678, filed August 4, 1997, 60/061,097, filed October 3, 1997,

60/087,561, filed June 1, 1998, and is a continuing application of U.S.S.N. 09/127,926, filed July 31, 1998, and 09/058,459, filed April 10, 1998.--

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 87, line 9, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--**Table 11.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of  $G\beta 1$  as a function of  $\Delta h_{0,9}^a$ --*

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 88, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--**Table 12.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of  $G\beta 1$  as a function of  $\Delta h_{1,0}^a$ --*

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 89, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--**Table 13.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of  $G\beta 1$  as a function of  $\Delta \Omega_{0,9}^a$ --*

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 90, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--**Table 14.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of  $G\beta 1$  as a function of  $\Delta \theta_{0,9}^a$ --*

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 91, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--**Table 15.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of  $G\beta 1$  as a function of  $\Delta \sigma_{0,9}^a$ --*

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 91, line 21, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--The optimal sequence for the ten core positions of G $\beta$ 1 that is calculated using the native backbone (i.e., no perturbation) contains three conservative mutations relative to the wild-type sequence (Table 11). Y3F and V39I are likely the result of the hydrophobic surface area burial term in the scoring function. L7I reflects a bias in the rotamer library used for these calculations. The crystal structure of G $\beta$ 1 has the leucine at position 7 with a nearly eclipsed  $\chi_2$  of 111°. This strained  $\chi_2$  is unlikely to be an artifact of the structure determination since it is present in two crystal forms and a solution structure (Gronenborn et al., 1991; Gallagher et al., 1994). Our rotamer library does not contain eclipsed rotamers and no staggered leucine rotamers pack well at this position. Instead, the side-chain selection algorithm chose an isoleucine rotamer that conserves the  $\chi_1$  dihedral and is able to pack well. We expect the removal of the strained leucine rotamer to stabilize the protein, a prediction that is tested in the experimental section of this work. The sequences that result from varying individual super-secondary structure parameter values show two notable trends. Small variations in the parameter values tend to have little or no effect on the calculated sequences. For example, varying  $\Delta h_{0,9}$  from -0.25 to -1.00 Å (Table 11) and  $\Delta h_{1,0}$  from +0.25 to +1.25 Å (Table 2) has no effect on the calculated sequences which demonstrates the side-chain selection algorithm's tolerance to small variations in the initial backbone geometry. Large variations in the parameter values tend to result in greater sequence diversity. For example,  $\Delta h_{1,0}[+1.50\text{Å}]$  contains six out of ten possible mutations relative to G $\beta$ 1 (Table 12). The apparently anomalous result that occurs for  $\Delta h_{0,9}$  at -1.25 and -1.50 Å, an increase in core volume, is explained by the observation that translating the helix towards the sheet plane results in creating a pocket of space in the vicinity of position 20 that ultimately leads to the observed A20V mutation.--

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 92, line 10, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--Experimental validation of the designed cores focused on seven of the  $\Delta h$ -series mutants which contain between three and six sequence changes relative to G $\beta$ 1. The designed sequences resulting from  $\Delta\Omega$ ,  $\Delta\theta$  and  $\Delta\sigma$  perturbations are, however, in many cases identical to various  $\Delta h$ -series sequences. Typical far UV circular dichroism (CD) spectra are shown in Figure 15.  $\Delta h_{0,9}[-1.00\text{\AA}]$ ,  $\Delta h_{0,9}[0.00\text{\AA}]$ ,  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+0.75\text{\AA}]$  and  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.00\text{\AA}]$  have CD spectra that are indistinguishable from that of G $\beta$ 1 while  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{\AA}]$ ,  $\Delta h_{1,0}[+1.50\text{\AA}]$  and  $\Delta h_{0,9}[-1.50\text{\AA}]$  have CD spectra similar to that of G $\beta$ 1 suggesting that all of the mutants have a secondary structure content similar to the wild-type protein. Thermal melts monitored by CD are shown in Figure 16. All of the mutants have cooperative transitions with melting temperatures ( $T_m$ 's) ranging from 53 °C for  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{\AA}]$  to 91 °C for  $\Delta h_{0,9}[0.00\text{\AA}]$  (Table 11). The  $T_m$  for G $\beta$ 1 is 85°C. The measured  $T_m$ 's for  $\Delta h_{0,9}[-1.50\text{\AA}]$  and  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{\AA}]$  are for 56 residue proteins compared to 57 residue proteins in all other cases (see Methods and materials) which results in  $T_m$ 's that are estimated to be about 2 °C higher than what would be expected for the corresponding 57 residue proteins based on the  $T_m$  difference between the 56 and 57 residue versions of G $\beta$ 1. The removal of the strained leucine at position seven (L7I) along with the increased hydrophobic burial generated by the Y3F and V39I mutations in  $\Delta h_{0,9}[0.00\text{\AA}]$  result in a protein that is measurable more stable than wild-type G $\beta$ 1. The extent of chemical shift dispersion in the 1D  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectrum of each mutant was assessed to gauge each protein's degree of native-like character (Fig. 5). All of the mutants, except  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{\AA}]$ , have NMR spectra with chemical shift dispersion similar to that of G $\beta$ 1 suggesting that the proteins form well-ordered structures.  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{\AA}]$  has a spectrum with broad peaks

and no dispersion, which is indicative of a collapsed but disordered and fluctuating structure or non-specific association. All seven mutant proteins retain their ability to bind IgG as measured by binding to an IgG-Sepharose affinity column. The stability and native-like character of  $\Delta h_{0.9}[-1.50\text{\AA}]$  and  $\Delta h_{1.0}[+1.50\text{\AA}]$  indicate that the sequence selection algorithm is sufficiently robust to tolerate  $\Delta h$  perturbations that are as large as 15% of G $\beta$ 1's native height super-secondary structure parameter value of 10  $\text{\AA}$ .--

In the Claims:

Please cancel claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Please add the following claims:

- 30. A method executed by a computer under the control of a program, said computer including a memory for storing said program, said method comprising the steps of:
- (A) receiving a protein backbone structure with variable residue positions;
  - (B) altering at least one supersecondary structure parameter value of said protein backbone structure;
  - (C) establishing a group of potential amino acids for each of said variable residue positions; and
  - (D) analyzing the interaction of all or part of each of said amino acids with all or part of the remainder of said protein backbone structure to generate a set of optimized protein sequences, wherein said analyzing step includes a Dead-End Elimination (DEE) computation.

31. A method executed by a computer under the control of a program, said computer including a memory for storing said program, said method comprising the steps of:

- (A) receiving a protein backbone structure with variable residue positions;
- (B) altering at least one supersecondary structure parameter value of said protein backbone structure prior to establishing a group of potential amino acids;
- (C) classifying each variable residue position as either a core, surface or boundary residue;
- (D) establishing a group of potential amino acids for each of said variable residue positions, wherein the group of potential amino acids for at least one of said variable residue position has an amino acid selected from each of at least two different amino acids; and
- (E) analyzing the interaction of all or part of each of said amino acids with all or part of the remainder of said protein to generate a set of optimized protein sequences.

32. A method according to claim 31 wherein said analyzing step comprises a DEE computation.

33. A method according to claim 30 or 32 wherein said set of optimized protein sequences comprises the globally optimal protein sequence.

34. A method according to claim 30 or 32 wherein said DEE computation is selected from the group consisting of original DEE and Goldstein DEE.

35. A method according to claim 30 or 32 wherein said analyzing step includes the use of at least one scoring function.

36. A method according to claim 35 wherein said scoring function is selected from the group consisting of a Van der Waals potential scoring function, a hydrogen bond potential scoring function, an atomic solvation scoring function, an electrostatic scoring function and a secondary structure propensity scoring function.

37. A method according to claim 35 wherein said analyzing step includes the use of at least two scoring functions.

38. A method according to claim 35 wherein said analyzing step includes the use of at least three scoring functions.

39. A method according to claim 35 wherein said analyzing step includes the use of at least four scoring functions.

40. A method according to claim 35 wherein said atomic solvation scoring function includes a scaling factor that compensates for over-counting.

41. A method according to claim 30 or 31 further comprising experimentally testing at least one member of said set.

42. A method according to claim 33 further comprising the step of:

generating a rank ordered list of additional optimal sequences from said globally optimal protein sequence.

43. A method according to claim 42 wherein said generating includes the use of a Monte Carlo search.

44. A method according to claim 31 wherein said analyzing step comprises a Monte Carlo computation.

45. A method according to claim 42 further comprising the step of:  
testing some or all of said protein sequences from said ordered list to produce potential energy test results.

46. A method according to claim 45 further comprising the step of:  
analyzing the correspondence between said potential energy test results and theoretical potential energy data.

47. A recombinant protein comprising an optimized protein sequence generated by the method of claim 30 or 31.

48. A nucleic acid sequence encoding a recombinant protein according to claim 47.

49. An expression vector comprising the nucleic acid sequence of claim 48.



50. A host cell comprising the nucleic acid sequence of claim 48.

51. A method executed by a computer under the control of a program, said computer including a memory for storing said program, said method comprising the steps of:

- (A) receiving a protein backbone structure with variable residue positions;
- (B) altering at least one supersecondary structure parameter value of said protein backbone structure;
- (C) establishing a group of potential amino acids for each of said variable residue positions, wherein the group of potential amino acids for at least one of said variable residue position has a amino acid selected from each of at least two different amino acids; and
- (D) analyzing the interaction of all or part of each of said amino acids with all or part of the remainder of said protein backbone structure to generate a set of optimized protein sequences, wherein said analyzing step includes:
  - i. a Dead-End Elimination (DEE) computation; and,
  - ii. at least one scoring function selected from the group consisting of a Van der Waals potential scoring function, a hydrogen bond potential scoring function, an atomic solvation scoring function, an electrostatic scoring function and a secondary structure propensity scoring function.

52. A method executed by a computer under the control of a program, said computer including a memory for storing said program, said method comprising the steps of:

- (A) receiving a protein backbone structure with variable residue positions;

(B) altering at least one supersecondary structure parameter value of said protein backbone structure;

(C) classifying each variable residue position as either a core, surface or boundary residue;

(D) establishing a group of potential amino acids for each of said variable residue positions, wherein the group of potential amino acids for at least one of said variable residue position has a amino acid selected from each of at least two different amino acids; and

(E) analyzing the interaction of all or part of each of said amino acids with all or part of the remainder of said protein to generate a set of optimized protein sequences wherein said analyzing step includes:

- i. a Dead-End Elimination (DEE) computation; and,
- ii. at least one scoring function selected from the group consisting of a Van der Waals potential scoring function, a hydrogen bond potential scoring function, an atomic solvation scoring function, an electrostatic scoring function and a secondary structure propensity scoring function.--

## REMARKS

Claim 1 has been cancelled. Claims 30-52 are newly added.

Support for new claims 30-52 is found in original claims 1-17, 19-22. and 30-31.

The amendment of the paragraph beginning on page 1, line 2 was made to state the relationship of the present application to serial no.09/127,926.

Secondly, Table numbers 1-5 were duplicated in Tables appearing later on in the application, i.e., on pages 87-92. Applicants have corrected this typographical error, by renumbering these Tables sequentially. Thus, the Table number of the Table appearing in the paragraph beginning at page 87, line9, has been changed from Table 1 to Table 11. Similarly, the Table numbers appearing on page 88, line1, page 89, line 1, page 90, line 1 and page 91, line 1 have been changed as follows: Table 2 has been changed to Table 12 (page 88); Table 3 has been changed to Table 13 (page 89); Table 4 has been changed to Table 14 (page 90) and Table 5 has been changed to Table 15. In addition, references in the text to Table 1 and Table 2 on pages 91-92 have been changed to Tables11 and 12 to be internally consistent.

Applicants submit the amendments to the specification do not raise new issues requiring further examination. The Tables mislabeled with numbers 1-5 were present in the original application. The change in numbers is required to properly reference the Tables cited in the application.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and the claims by the preliminary amendment. The attached page is captioned **“Version with markings to show changes made.”**

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1300 (Our Order No. A-65353-6/RFT/RMS/RMK).

Please direct any calls in connection with this application to the undersigned at (415) 781-1989.

Dated: 3/19/01

Respectfully submitted,

FLEHR, HOHBACH, TEST,  
ALBRITTON & HERBERT

By:   
Renee M Kosslak, P47,717  
for Robin M. Silva Reg. No. 38,304

Four Embarcadero Center - Suite 3400  
San Francisco, California 94111-4187  
Tel.: (415) 781-1989  
Fax: (415) 398-3249  
1045816

## VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

### In the specification:

Paragraph beginning at line 2 of page 1 has been amended as follows:

This application claims the benefit [is a continuing application] of U.S.S.N.s 60/043,464, filed April 11, 1997, 60/054,678, filed August 4, 1997, 60/061,097, filed October 3, 1997, [09/058,459, filed April 10, 1998, and] 60/087,561, filed June 1, 1998, and is a continuing application of U.S.S.N. 09/127,926, filed July 31, 1998 and 09/058,459, filed April 10, 1998.

Paragraph beginning at page 87, line 9, with the following rewritten paragraph:

**Table [1]11.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of G $\beta$ 1 as a function of  $\Delta h_{0,9}$ <sup>a</sup>*

Paragraph beginning at page 88, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

**Table [2]12.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of G $\beta$ 1 as a function of  $\Delta h_{1,0}$ <sup>a</sup>*

Paragraph beginning at page 89, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

**Table [3]13.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of G $\beta$ 1 as a function of  $\Delta \Omega_{0,9}$ <sup>a</sup>*

Paragraph beginning at page 90, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

**Table [4]14.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of G $\beta$ 1 as a function of  $\Delta \theta_{0,9}$ <sup>a</sup>--*

Paragraph beginning at page 91, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

**Table [5]15.** *DEE determined optimal sequences for the core positions of G $\beta$ 1 as a function of  $\Delta \sigma_{0,9}$ <sup>a</sup>*

Paragraph beginning at page 91, line 21, with the following rewritten paragraph:

The optimal sequence for the ten core positions of G $\beta$ 1 that is calculated using the native backbone (i.e., no perturbation) contains three conservative mutations relative to the wild-type sequence (Table [1]11). Y3F and V39I are likely the result of the hydrophobic surface area burial term in the scoring function. L7I reflects a bias in the rotamer library used for these calculations. The crystal structure of G $\beta$ 1 has the leucine at position 7 with a nearly eclipsed  $\chi_2$  of 111°. This strained  $\chi_2$  is unlikely to be an artifact of the structure determination since it is present in two crystal forms and a solution structure (Gronenborn et al., 1991; Gallagher et al., 1994). Our rotamer library does not contain eclipsed rotamers and no staggered leucine rotamers pack well at this position. Instead, the side-chain selection algorithm chose an isoleucine rotamer that conserves the  $\chi_1$  dihedral and is able to pack well. We expect the removal of the strained leucine rotamer to stabilize the protein, a prediction that is tested in the experimental section of this work. The sequences that result from varying individual super-secondary structure parameter values show two notable trends. Small variations in the parameter values tend to have little or no effect on the calculated sequences. For example, varying  $\Delta h_{0,9}$  from -0.25 to -1.00 Å (Table [1]11)

and  $\Delta h_{1,0}$  from +0.25 to +1.25 Å (Table 2) has no effect on the calculated sequences which demonstrates the side-chain selection algorithm's tolerance to small variations in the initial backbone geometry. Large variations in the parameter values tend to result in greater sequence diversity. For example,  $\Delta h_{1,0}[+1.50\text{Å}]$  contains six out of ten possible mutations relative to Gβ1 (Table [2][12]). The apparently anomalous result that occurs for  $\Delta h_{0,9}$  at -1.25 and -1.50 Å, an increase in core volume, is explained by the observation that translating the helix towards the sheet plane results in creating a pocket of space in the vicinity of position 20 that ultimately leads to the observed A20V mutation.

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 92, line 10, with the following rewritten paragraph:

Experimental validation of the designed cores focused on seven of the  $\Delta h$ -series mutants which contain between three and six sequence changes relative to Gβ1. The designed sequences resulting from  $\Delta\Omega$ ,  $\Delta\theta$  and  $\Delta\sigma$  perturbations are, however, in many cases identical to various  $\Delta h$ -series sequences. Typical far UV circular dichroism (CD) spectra are shown in Figure 15.  $\Delta h_{0,9}[-1.00\text{Å}]$ ,  $\Delta h_{0,9}[0.00\text{Å}]$ ,  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+0.75\text{Å}]$  and  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.00\text{Å}]$  have CD spectra that are indistinguishable from that of Gβ1 while  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{Å}]$ ,  $\Delta h_{1,0}[+1.50\text{Å}]$  and  $\Delta h_{0,9}[-1.50\text{Å}]$  have CD spectra similar to that of Gβ1 suggesting that all of the mutants have a secondary structure content similar to the wild-type protein. Thermal melts monitored by CD are shown in Figure 16. All of the mutants have cooperative transitions with melting temperatures ( $T_m$ 's) ranging from 53 °C for  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{Å}]$  to 91 °C for  $\Delta h_{0,9}[0.00\text{Å}]$  (Table [1][11]). The  $T_m$  for Gβ1 is 85°C. The measured  $T_m$ 's for  $\Delta h_{0,9}[-1.50\text{Å}]$  and  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{Å}]$  are for 56 residue proteins compared to 57 residue proteins in all other cases (see Methods and materials) which results in  $T_m$ 's that are estimated to be about 2 °C higher than what would be expected for the corresponding 57 residue proteins based on the  $T_m$  difference between the 56 and 57 residue versions of Gβ1. The removal of the strained leucine at position seven (L7I) along with the increased hydrophobic burial generated by the Y3F and V39I mutations in  $\Delta h_{0,9}[0.00\text{Å}]$  result in a protein that is measurable more stable than wild-type Gβ1. The extent of chemical shift dispersion in the 1D  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectrum of each mutant was assessed to gauge each protein's degree of native-like character (Fig. 5). All of the mutants, except  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{Å}]$ , have NMR spectra with chemical shift dispersion similar to that of Gβ1 suggesting that the proteins form well-ordered structures.  $\Delta h_{0,9}[+1.50\text{Å}]$  has a spectrum with broad peaks and no dispersion, which is indicative of a collapsed but disordered and fluctuating structure or non-specific association. All seven mutant proteins retain their ability to bind IgG as measured by binding to an IgG-Sepharose affinity column. The stability and native-like character of  $\Delta h_{0,9}[-1.50\text{Å}]$  and  $\Delta h_{1,0}[+1.50\text{Å}]$  indicate that the sequence selection algorithm is sufficiently robust to tolerate  $\Delta h$  perturbations that are as large as 15% of Gβ1's native height super-secondary structure parameter value of 10 Å.

### **In the Claims:**

Claim 1 has been canceled.